arXiv:nucl-th/0210038v1 13 Oct 2002

The $su(1,1)$-Algebraic Boson Model in the Deformed Boson Scheme

—— *The Second Holstein-Primakoff Representation as q-Deformed Boson Operator* ——

Atsushi Kuriyama,[1] Constança Providência[2],
João da Providência[2], Yasuhiko Tsue[3] and Masatoshi Yamamura[1]

[1]*Faculty of Engineering, Kansai University, Suita 564-8680, Japan*
[2]*Departamento de Fisica, Universidade de Coimbra, P-3000 Coimbra, Portugal*
[3]*Physics Division, Faculty of Science, Kochi University, Kochi 780-8520, Japan*

Abstract

Following the deformed boson scheme leading to the $su(1,1)$-algebra, a certain simple boson system is deformed in the framework of the second Holstein-Primakoff representation. With the aid of the MYT boson mapping, the second representation arrives at the first Holstein-Primakoff representation. The $su(1,1)$-algebraic model obtained in this procedure is compared with that in the Schwinger representation investigated by three of the present authors (A.K., Y.T. and M.Y.).

typeset using $\mathcal{PTP}$TEX.sty <ver.1.0>

The q-deformation provides us an attractive concept for understanding many-boson systems. However, if the quantity $[x]_q$ characterizing the deformation is restricted to the form $(q^x - q^{-x})/(q - q^{-1})$, variation of the deformations is not so rich as expected. Concerning the choice of $[x]_q$, Penson and Solomon stressed that the above form is nothing but one of the choices of the functions $[x]_q$. 1) Recently, generalizing their viewpoint, the present authors proposed a possible method for the deformed boson scheme in the time-dependent variational method. 2), 3) Following this scheme, in Ref. 3), we formulated the $su(2)_q$- and the $su(1,1)_q$-algebras in the Holstein-Primakoff representation. Furthermore, in Ref. 3), we gave two simple applications mainly related to the $su(2)$-algebra. In this note, we present a simple application related to the $su(1,1)$-algebra, which enables us to describe the damped and the amplified oscillation in relation to thermal effects.

Three of the present authors (A.K., Y.T. and M.Y.) investigated thermal effects appearing in various $su(2)$-algebraic models. 4), 5) The basis of this investigation is the use of the $su(1,1)$-algebraic boson model based on the Schwinger representation and the time-evolution is treated by the time-dependent variational method. The prototypes of this investigation are found in several papers. 6), 7) The time-evolutions of many-body systems, for example, the squeezed state, including the states discussed in Refs. 4), 5) and 7) are reviewed by the present authors. 8) The aim of this note is to reinvestigate the same problem as that discussed in Refs. 4) and 5) in the frame of the $su(1,1)$-algebraic model in the Holstein-Primakoff representation, including some remarks on the results obtained in Ref. 5) and the present paper.

For the above-mentioned aim, we adopt a many-boson system consisting of two kinds of boson operators $(\breve{c}, \breve{c}^*)$ and $(\breve{d}, \breve{d}^*)$. The Hamiltonian which concerns us is given in the form

$$\breve{H} = \breve{H}_c + \breve{H}_d + \breve{H}_{cd} \ , \tag{1a}$$

$$\breve{H}_c = \epsilon \breve{c}^* \breve{c} \ , \tag{1b}$$

$$\breve{H}_d = \omega \breve{d}^* \breve{d} \ , \tag{1c}$$

$$\breve{H}_{cd} = -i\chi/2 \cdot (\breve{c}^* \breve{d} - \breve{d}^* \breve{c}) \ . \tag{1d}$$

Here, ϵ, ω and χ denote real parameters. In associating with the form (1b), we note the following relation :

$$\breve{c}^* \breve{c} = \sqrt{\frac{2(1+\zeta)}{1+[\breve{c},\breve{c}^*]+2\zeta}}\ \breve{c}^* \breve{c}\ \sqrt{\frac{2(1+\zeta)}{1+[\breve{c},\breve{c}^*]+2\zeta}} \ . \tag{2a}$$

Here, ζ denotes a real parameter and, later, it is regarded as infinitesimal. In Ref.3), we used, in the present notation,

$$\breve{c}^* \breve{c} = \breve{c}^* \frac{2}{1+[\breve{c},\breve{c}^*]} \breve{c} \ . \tag{2b}$$

Since $[\breve{c},\breve{c}^*]=1$, the relation (2a) and (2b) are identical equations.

Following the basic idea shown in the relation (30) of Ref. 3), let the boson $(\breve{c},\breve{c}^*)$ deform in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\breve{\gamma}=\sqrt{\breve{N}/n_0-1}\ \breve{c}=(\sqrt{n_0})^{-1}\sqrt{\breve{N}-n_0}\ \breve{c}\ ,\\
&\breve{\gamma}^*=\breve{c}^*\ \sqrt{\breve{N}/n_0-1}=(\sqrt{n_0})^{-1}\breve{c}^*\ \sqrt{\breve{N}-n_0}\ ,\\
&\breve{N}=\breve{c}^*\breve{c}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here, n_0 denotes a positive integer. The commutation relation of $\breve{\gamma}$ and $\breve{\gamma}^*$ is obtained in the form

$$[\breve{\gamma},\breve{\gamma}^*]=2\breve{N}/n_0-1\ . \tag{4}$$

The second Holstein-Primakoff representation of the $su(1,1)$-algebra, which was called by the present authors in Ref. 3), is given as

$$\breve{T}_-=\sqrt{n_0}\cdot\breve{\gamma}\ ,\qquad \breve{T}_+=\sqrt{n_0}\cdot\breve{\gamma}^*\ ,\qquad \breve{T}_0=(n_0/2)\cdot[\breve{\gamma},\breve{\gamma}^*]\ . \tag{5}$$

We do not deform the boson $(\breve{d},\breve{d}^*)$. Under the above scheme, we perform the deformation for the Hamiltonian (1a), which is formally written as

$$\breve{H}^{(\mathrm{def})}=\breve{H}_c^{(\mathrm{def})}+\breve{H}_d^{(\mathrm{def})}+\breve{H}_{cd}^{(\mathrm{def})}\ . \tag{6}$$

For the deformation of $\breve{H}_c$, the relation (2a) is useful. In the present case, the relation (2a) leads us to

$$\sqrt{\frac{2(1+\zeta)}{1+[\breve{\gamma},\breve{\gamma}^*]+2\zeta}}\ \breve{\gamma}^*\breve{\gamma}\ \sqrt{\frac{2(1+\zeta)}{1+[\breve{\gamma},\breve{\gamma}^*]+2\zeta}}=[\breve{c}^*\breve{c}-(n_0+1)]\cdot\frac{(1+\zeta)\breve{N}}{\breve{N}+\zeta}\ . \tag{7}$$

As is clear from the relation (3), $(\hat{N}/n_0-1)$ should be positive definite and, then, at the limit $\zeta\rightarrow 0$, $(1+\zeta)\breve{N}/(\breve{N}+\zeta)\rightarrow 1$. Thus, we have

$$[\breve{c}^*\breve{c}-(n_0+1)]\cdot\frac{(1+\zeta)\breve{N}}{\breve{N}+\zeta}\longrightarrow\breve{c}^*\breve{c}-(n_0+1)\ . \tag{8}$$

Then, $\breve{H}_c^{(\mathrm{def})}$ is written in the form

$$\breve{H}_c^{(\mathrm{def})}=\epsilon\breve{c}^*\breve{c}-\epsilon(n_0+1)\ . \tag{9a}$$

As was already mentioned, we do not deform the boson $(\breve{d},\breve{d}^*)$. Therefore, we have

$$\breve{H}_d^{(\mathrm{def})}=\omega\breve{d}^*\breve{d}\ , \tag{9b}$$

$$\breve{H}_{cd}^{(\mathrm{def})}=-i(\chi/2\sqrt{n_0})\cdot[\breve{c}^*\sqrt{\breve{N}-n_0}\ \breve{d}-\breve{d}^*\sqrt{\breve{N}-n_0}\ \breve{c}]\ . \tag{9c}$$

The above is the present deformed Hamiltonian. The term, $-\epsilon(n_0+1)$, in $\breve{H}_c^{(\rm def)}$ plays a role of shifting the value of the energy and does not give any influence on the dynamics.

It may be self-evident that the Hamiltonian (6) is treated in the orthogonal set $\{|n_0+1+n\rangle\!\rangle\ ;\ n=0,1,2,\cdots\}$:

$$|n_0+1+n\rangle\!\rangle = \left(\sqrt{(n_0+1+n)!}\right)^{-1}\cdot(\breve{c}^*)^{n_0+1+n}|0\rangle\!\rangle\ . \tag{10}$$

Clearly, concerning the boson number $\breve{N}$ $(=\breve{c}^*\breve{c})$, the minimum value is (n_0+1). Therefore, it may be convenient to describe the boson number in terms of the minimum value plus its fluctuation. For this aim, the idea of the MYT boson mapping [9)] is available. The mapped space consists of the orthogonal set $\{|n\rangle\ ;\ n=0,1,2,\cdots\}$:

$$|n\rangle = (\sqrt{n!})^{-1}\cdot(\hat{\alpha}^*)^n|0\rangle\ . \qquad (\hat{\alpha}|0\rangle=0) \tag{11}$$

Of course, $(\hat{\alpha},\hat{\alpha}^*)$ denotes the boson operator. Then, we define the mapping operator U in the form

$$U=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|n\rangle\langle\!\langle n_0+1+n|\ , \tag{12a}$$

$$UU^\dagger=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|n\rangle\langle n| = 1\ ,$$

$$U^\dagger U=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|n_0+1+n\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle n_0+1+n| = 1-\sum_{k=0}^{n_0}|k\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle k|\ . \tag{12b}$$

The operator U presents us the relation

$$U|n_0+1+n\rangle\!\rangle = |n\rangle\ . \tag{13}$$

The operator $\breve{c}^*\breve{c}$ is mapped on the form

$$U\breve{c}^*\breve{c}U^\dagger = n_0+1+\hat{N}\ , \qquad \hat{N}=\hat{\alpha}^*\hat{\alpha}\ . \tag{14}$$

Further, for the set $\{T_-,T_+,T_0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&U\breve{T}_-U^\dagger=\hat{T}_-\ , \qquad \hat{T}_-=\sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}}\ \hat{\alpha}\ ,\\
&U\breve{T}_+U^\dagger=\hat{T}_+\ , \qquad \hat{T}_+=\hat{\alpha}^*\sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}}\ ,\\
&U\breve{T}_0U^\dagger=\hat{T}_0\ , \qquad \hat{T}_0=(n_0+2)/2+\hat{N}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

It may be clear that the form (14) comes up to our expectation. The operator $\hat{N}$ describes the fluctuation. The set $\{\hat{T}_-,\hat{T}_+,\hat{T}_0\}$ denotes the first Holstein-Primakoff representation of the $su(1,1)$-algebra, in which the magnitude of the $su(1,1)$-spin is $(n_0+2)/2$. This form was also discussed in Ref. 3). Thus, the Hamiltonian mapped from the form (6) can be expressed as follows :

$$\hat{H}^{(\mathrm{def})} = \hat{H}_c^{(\mathrm{def})} + \hat{H}_d^{(\mathrm{def})} + \hat{H}_{cd}^{(\mathrm{def})} \ , \tag{16a}$$

$$\hat{H}_c^{(\mathrm{def})} = \epsilon(n_0+1) + \epsilon\hat{\alpha}^*\hat{\alpha} \ , \tag{16b}$$

$$\hat{H}_d^{(\mathrm{def})} = \omega\breve{d}^*\breve{d} \ , \tag{16c}$$

$$\hat{H}_{cd}^{(\mathrm{def})} = -i(\chi/2\sqrt{n_0})\cdot[\hat{\alpha}^*\sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}}\ \breve{d} - \breve{d}^*\sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}}\ \hat{\alpha}] \ . \tag{16d}$$

For the Hamiltonian (16a), the following picture can be drawn : Let us imagine that the external environment, such as heat bath, is described by the boson $(\breve{d},\breve{d}^*)$. The harmonic oscillation described by the boson $(\breve{c},\breve{c}^*)$ may be damped or amplified in terms of the interaction to the external environment which is assumed to be extremely big system. Therefore, for the boson $(\breve{d},\breve{d}^*)$, we can neglect the fluctuation around the equilibrium value. This means that $(\breve{d},\breve{d}^*)$ can be replaced by the time-independent c-number (δ,δ^*). It may be performed by calculating the expectation value of $\hat{H}^{(\mathrm{def})}$ for the boson coherent state for $(\breve{d},\breve{d}^*)$. The c-number (δ,δ^*) can be expressed as

$$\delta = |\delta|\exp(-i\phi) \ , \qquad \delta^* = |\delta|\exp(+i\phi) \ . \tag{17}$$

Then, the boson $(\hat{\alpha},\hat{\alpha}^*)$ is redefined in the form

$$\hat{\alpha} \longrightarrow \hat{\alpha}\exp(+i\phi) \ , \qquad \hat{\alpha}^* \longrightarrow \hat{\alpha}^*\exp(-i\phi) \ . \tag{18}$$

With the use of the relation (17) and (18), the Hamiltonian (16a) can be modified in the following form :

$$\hat{H} = E + \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_i \ , \tag{19a}$$

$$E = \epsilon(n_0+1) + \omega|\delta|^2 \ , \tag{19b}$$

$$\hat{H}_0 = \epsilon\hat{\alpha}^*\hat{\alpha} = -\epsilon(n_0+2)/2 + \epsilon\hat{T}_0 \ , \tag{19c}$$

$$\hat{H}_i = -i(\eta/2)\cdot[\hat{\alpha}^*\sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}} - \sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}}\ \hat{\alpha}] = -i(\eta/2)\cdot(\hat{T}_+ - \hat{T}_-) \ , \tag{19d}$$

$$\eta = \chi|\delta|/\sqrt{n_0} \ . \tag{19e}$$

The Hamiltonian (19a) is essentially of the same form as that derived in nuclear $su(2)$-models in the Schwinger boson representation for the $su(1,1)$-algebra.[4)] The Schwinger representation for the $su(1,1)$-algebra is given as

$$\hat{T}_-^{(s)} = \hat{a}\hat{b} \ , \qquad \hat{T}_+^{(s)} = \hat{b}^*\hat{a}^* \ , \qquad \hat{T}_0^{(s)} = (\hat{b}\hat{b}^* + \hat{a}^*\hat{a})/2 \ . \tag{20}$$

Here, $(\hat{a}, \hat{a}^*)$ and $(\hat{b}, \hat{b}^*)$ denote boson operators. If $(\hat{T}_-, \hat{T}_+, \hat{T}_0)$ in the Hamiltonian (19a) is replaced with the form (20), it is reduced to the Hamiltonian derived in Ref. 4). Further, the time-evolution of the system described in terms of the Hamiltonian, which is essentially the same as that shown in the form (19a), was investigated in the framework of the time-dependent variational method. 5) The prototypes of these investigations can be found in several papers. 6), 7) The time-evolution of many-body systems including the problems discussed in Refs. 6) and 7) are reviewed by the present authors. 8)

As a trial state for the variation, in Ref. 5), the following wave packet was adopted :

$$|c) = U^{-1}\exp(-|W|^2)\cdot\exp[(V/U)\hat{T}_+^{(s)}]|m) \ , \tag{21a}$$

$$|m) = \exp(\sqrt{2}W/U\cdot\hat{b}^*)|0) \ . \qquad (\hat{a}|0) = \hat{b}|0) = 0 \ , \quad ((c|c) = 0) \tag{21b}$$

Here, U and V denote real and complex parameters, respectively, satisfying

$$U^2 - |V|^2 = 1 \ . \tag{22}$$

The quantity W is also complex and $(2|W|^2+1)/2$ plays a role of the magnitude of the $su(1,1)$-spin, such as $(n_0+2)/2$. It should be noted that the state $|m)$ obeys the condition

$$\hat{T}_-^{(s)}|m) = 0 \ . \tag{23}$$

The wave packet (21a) is translated into the following form, $|c\rangle$, in the case of the Holstein-Primakoff representation for the $su(1,1)$-algebra :

$$|c\rangle = u^{-(n_0+2)}\cdot\exp[(v/u)\hat{a}^*\sqrt{n_0+2+\hat{N}}]|0\rangle \ . \qquad (\langle c|c\rangle = 1) \tag{24}$$

Here, u and v denote real and complex parameters, respectively, obeying

$$u^2 - |v|^2 = 1 \ . \tag{25}$$

In the case of the Schwinger representation, there exist infinite possibilities for selecting the state $|m)$ and, in Ref. 5), the form (21b) was adopted. However, in the present case, the state obeying the condition (23) is uniquely given as $|m\rangle = |0\rangle$.

The time-dependence of v can be determined through the time-dependent variational method for the system under investigation. The state $|c\rangle$ is rewritten in the following form :

$$|c\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sigma_n|n\rangle \ , \qquad (\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|\sigma_n|^2 = 1) \tag{26}$$

$$\sigma_n = (v^n/u^{n_0+2+n})\sqrt{(n_0+1+n)!/n!(n_0+1)!} \ . \tag{27}$$

The state $|n\rangle$ is given in the relation (11). With the use of the canonicity condition, $^{10)}$ (v, v^*) can be parametrized in terms of the canonical variable (α, α^*) in the boson type which obeys the Poisson bracket relation

$$[\alpha, \alpha^*]_P = -i \ . \tag{28}$$

The parameter (v, v^*) is given by

$$v = \left(\sqrt{n_0+2}\right)^{-1} \cdot \alpha \ , \qquad v^* = \left(\sqrt{n_0+2}\right)^{-1} \cdot \alpha^* \ . \tag{29}$$

The expectation values of the operators composing the Hamiltonian (19a) are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle c|\hat{T}_-|c\rangle = (n_0+2)uv = \sqrt{n_0+2+N}\ \alpha \ , \\
&\langle c|\hat{T}_+|c\rangle = (n_0+2)uv^* = \alpha^*\sqrt{n_0+2+N} \ , \\
&\langle c|\hat{T}_0|c\rangle = (n_0+2)/2 + (n_0+2)|v|^2 = (n_0+2)/2 + N, \qquad (30) \\
&N = \alpha^*\alpha \ . \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

We can see that, in the Poisson bracket relation (28), the expectation value (30) is classical counterpart of $(\hat{T}_-, \hat{T}_+, \hat{T}_0)$. Under the above preparation, the Hamilton equation for the expectation value $\langle c|\hat{H}|c\rangle$ as the classical Hamiltonian can be solved and the solutions are classified into the following three groups :

1) $\epsilon^2 > \eta^2$: the solution is expressed in terms of trigometric function for $\sqrt{\epsilon^2-\eta^2}\ t$, (32a)

2) $\epsilon^2 = \eta^2$: the solution is expressed in terms of quadratic function for ϵt , (32b)

3) $\epsilon^2 < \eta^2$: the solution is expressed in terms of hyperbolic function for $\sqrt{\eta^2-\epsilon^2}\ t$. (32c)

The details are found in Refs. 5) and 8).

In Ref. 5), thermal effects observed in the $su(1,1)$-algebraic model were investigated. Of course, the basic idea comes from the prototype of the investigation. $^{7)}$ The viewpoint was as follows : Presupposing that the wave packet (21a) expresses the statistically mixed state, the entropy can be introduced in the present system and, various quantities characterizing thermal effects can be calculated. In this paper, we borrow the above viewpoint. If we stand on this point, the quantity $|\sigma_n|^2$ appearing in the relations (26) and (27) denotes the statistically mixed weight for the pure state labeled by n. Then, the entropy σ in the standard form is given as

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\sigma_n|^2 \cdot \log|\sigma_n|^2 \ . \tag{33}$$

Of course, $|\sigma_n|^2$ is given as

$$|\sigma_n|^2 = [(|v|^2)^n/(u^2)^{n_0+2+n}] \cdot [(n_0+1+n)!/n!(n_0+1)!] \ . \tag{34}$$

In principle, we can calculate the entropy directly by the form (33). However, it may be impossible to provide a systematic method for the calculation of the part of the logarithm. Then, we borrow the form presented by Tsallis 11) as a tool for the calculation of the entropy (33). With the relation to the standard form (33), Tsallis' form is given as

$$\sigma(q) = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(|\sigma_n|^2)^q - 1\right)/(1-q) \ . \qquad (q \ : \ \text{possitive parameter}) \tag{35}$$

$$\sigma = \lim_{q\to 1}\sigma(q) \ . \tag{36}$$

For the calculation of $\sigma(q)$ in terms of the power series expansion for the parameter (n_0+1), the following formula for (n_0+1) is useful :

$$[(n_0+1+n)!/n!(n_0+1)!]^q = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(n)/n! \cdot (n_0+1)^k \ . \quad (n \geq 1) \tag{37a}$$

Here, $f_k(n)$ obeys the recursion formula

$$f_{k+1}(n) = q\sum_{m=0}^{k}(-)^m[k!/(k-m)!] \cdot f_{k-m}(n)\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-(m+1)} \ . \quad (f_0(n)=1) \tag{37b}$$

For example, we have

$$f_1(n) = q\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-1}\right) \ , \qquad f_2(n) = q^2\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-1}\right)^2 - q\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-2}\right) \ ,$$
$$f_3(n) = q^3\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-1}\right)^3 - 3q^2\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-1}\right)\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-2}\right) + 2q\left(\sum_{r=1}^{n} r^{-3}\right) \ . \tag{37c}$$

Straightforward calculation based on the formula (37a) leads us to the form

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(|\sigma_n|^2)^q = {} & [(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q]^{-1} \\ & \times\Big\{1 + (n_0+1)q[(q-1)\log u^2 - \log[(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q]] \\ & \quad + (n_0+1)^2/2 \cdot q^2[(q-1)\log u^2 - \log[(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q]]^2 \\ & \quad + (n_0+1)^2/2 \cdot q(q-1)\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}[(|v|^2/u^2)^q]^r \cdot r^{-2} + \cdots\Big\} \ .\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

It is enough for obtaining the limit (36) to calculate $[(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q]^{-1}$ and $\log[(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q]$ up to the order of $(q-1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & [(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q]^{-1} = 1 - (q-1)(u^2\log u^2 - |v|^2\log|v|^2) \ , \\ & \log[(u^2)^q - (|v|^2)^q] = (q-1)(u^2\log u^2 - |v|^2\log|v|^2) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Substituting the relation (39) into the form (38) and calculating the limit (36), we have the following form for the entropy :

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 + (n_0+1)\cdot\sigma_1 + (n_0+1)^2/2\cdot\sigma_2 + \cdots \ , \tag{40a}$$

$$\sigma_0 = u^2\cdot\log u^2 - |v|^2\cdot\log|v|^2 \ , \tag{40b}$$

$$\sigma_1 = |v|^2\cdot\log u^2 - |v|^2\cdot\log|v|^2 \ , \tag{40c}$$

$$\sigma_2 = -(|v|^2\cdot\log u^2 - |v|^2\cdot\log|v|^2) - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}(|v|^2/u^2)^r\cdot r^{-2} \ . \tag{40d}$$

The above is expressed in the frame of the quadratic for (n_0+1). On the other hand, the entropy calculated in the wave packet (21a) is given in the form 8)

$$\sigma^{(s)} = \sigma_0^{(s)} + (2|W|^2)\cdot\sigma_1^{(s)} + (2|W|^2)^2/2\cdot\sigma_2^{(s)} + \cdots \ , \tag{41a}$$

$$\sigma_0^{(s)} = U^2\cdot\log U^2 - |V|^2\cdot\log|V|^2 \ , \tag{41b}$$

$$\sigma_1^{(s)} = |V|^2\cdot\log U^2 - |V|^2\cdot\log|V|^2 \ , \tag{41c}$$

$$\sigma_2^{(s)} = -|V|^2/U^2 \ . \tag{41d}$$

The two wave packets (21a) and (24) are different from each other and we can see that the difference in the expression of the entropy appears in the third term. In Ref. 5), the third term was neglected under the expectation that this term may be small in a rather wide region of $|V|^2$. 5), 8) If this expectation is conserved in the present treatment, we can neglect the third term and the result is completely identical to that in Ref. 5). Thus, in the frame of the Holstein-Primakoff representation, we can reproduce the results obtained in the Schwinger representation.

However, the term in the expression of the entropy (40a) can be neglected or not ? The region, in which the third term is neglected, seems to be not so wide as that expected in Ref. 5). The impromptu idea for saving this situation is the use of the Padé approximation. In this case, the expression (40a) is modified in the form

$$\sigma = \sigma_0\cdot[1-(n_0+1)(\sigma_2/2\sigma_1 - \sigma_1/\sigma_0)][1-(n_0+1)(\sigma_2/2\sigma_1)]^{-1} \ . \tag{42}$$

The form (42) tells us the following : In the small region of (n_0+1), the main part comes from σ_0. On the other hand, in the large region, the main term appears in the form $\sigma_0(1-2\sigma_1^2/\sigma_0\sigma_2)$ and the term $2\sigma_1^2/\sigma_2$ may be of the same order. From the above simple consideration, the form (42) is expected to show rather stable behavior. Of course, for the calculation of the form (42), the explicit expression of the function $f(x)=\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} x^r\cdot r^{-2}$ is necessary, but, it is impossible to express it in terms of any elementary functions. A possible approximate expression in the region $0 \leq x \leq 1$, which is not so popular, is given, for example, in the form

$$f(x) \sim 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} [n^2(n+1)]^{-1} x^n + (m+1)[m^2(2m+1)]^{-1} x^m \\ +(1-x)/x \cdot \log(1-x) \ . \qquad (43a)$$

Here, m denotes positive integer ($m = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$). If m is chosen as large, the approximation becomes better. In the case $m = 4$, we have

$$f(x) \sim 1 + (1/2) \cdot x + (1/12) \cdot x^2 + (1/36) \cdot x^3 + (5/144) \cdot x^4 \\ +(1-x)/x \cdot \log(1-x) \ . \qquad (43b)$$

For example, we know the exact values $f(1/2) = \pi^2/12 - (\log 2)^2/2$ $(= 0.5822)$ and $f(1) = \pi^2/6$ $(= 1.6449)$. The form (43b) gives us the approximate values $f(1/2) \sim 0.5833$ and $f(1) \sim 1.6458$.

Finally, we give three remarks. First is related with the use of the state $|c\rangle$ shown in the relation (21a). For the present formalism, the use of the state (21a) is reasonable or not ? It should be discussed in relation to another form investigated by the present authors.12) As the second remark, we should note that in the present treatment, it is impossible to describe the cases $n_0 = 0$ and 1. It may be self-evident that the reason comes from the form (3). Third is as follows : The state $|c\rangle$ can be regarded as expressing the statistically mixed state or not ? In the case of the Schwinger representation, the degree of freedom characterizing the statistically mixed state is included in terms of the boson $(\hat{a}, \hat{a}^*)$ in addition to the degree of freedom for describing the physical object by the boson $(\hat{b}, \hat{b}^*)$. The present formalism does not contain such degree of freedom explicitly. Including such questions, we will contact with the problem discussed in this paper in more details.

Acknowledgements

The main part of this work was performed when two of the authors (Y.T. and M.Y.) stayed at Coimbra in August and September of 2002. They express their sincere thanks to Professor J. da Providência, co-author of this paper.

References

[1] K. A. Penson and A. I. Solomon, J. Math. Phys. **40** (1999), 2354.

[2] A. Kuriyama, C. Providência, J. da Providência, Y. Tsue and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106** (2001), 751; 765, ibid. **107** (2002), 65, ibid. **108** (2002) (accepted).

[3] A. Kuriyama, C. Providência, J. da Providência, Y. Tsue and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **107** (2002), 443.

[4] Y. Tsue, A. Kuriyama and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **93** (1995), 541.

[5] Y. Tsue, A. Kuriyama and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **93** (1995), 1037.

[6] E. Celeghini, M. Rasseti and G. Vitiello, Ann. of Phys. **215** (1992), 156.
E. Celeghini, M. Rasseti, M. Tarlini and G. Vitiello, Mod. Phys. Lett. **B3** (1989), 1213.

[7] Y. Tsue, A. Kuriyama and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **91** (1994), 49; 469.

[8] A. Kuriyama, J. da Providência, Y. Tsue and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. No. 141 (2001), 113.

[9] T. Marumori, M. Yamamura and A. Tokunaga, Prog. Theor. Phys. **31** (1964), 1009.

[10] T. Marumori, T. Maskawa, F. Sakata and A. Kuriyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **64** (1980), 1294.
M. Yamamura and A. Kuriyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. No. 93 (1987), 1.

[11] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. **52** (1988), 479.

[12] A. Kuriyama, C. Providência, J. da Providência, Y. Tsue and M. Yamamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **107** (2002), 1279.